REMARKS

This Response is filed in response to an *Advisory Action*, mailed July 14, 2004.
Claims 79-105 are pending in the application. In a *Final Office Action* mailed March 10,
2004, claims 79-105 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as allegedly
failing to provide an adequate written description and allegedly failing to adequately
teach how to make and use the invention. The rejection of claims 79-105 is maintained
in the *Advisory Action*.

The Applicant appreciates the time the Examiner took to discuss the *Advisory
Action* with Applicant's representative on August 6, 2004.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections.

I.   Force Feedback Command

The Advisory Action states that the previous reply "does NOT place the
application in condition for allowance because: claims recite force feedback command."
Advisory Action, page 2. The *Advisory Action* quotes the *Microsoft Computer
Dictionary*, 2nd Edition, "[c]ommands are **usually** either typed at the keyboard or chosen
from a menu with the keyboard or with an alternative input device, such as a mouse. *Id.*
(emphasis added by Applicant).

The definition provided in the *Advisory Action* is only one, very narrow definition
of the term "command." "Command" is understood to have a variety of definitions as it
relates to hardware, software, and other related technologies. For example, in a computer
science context, the *American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language* defines
command as "a signal that initiates an operation defined by an instruction." *The
American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition*, Houghton
Mifflin Company (2000). And the *Free On-line Dictionary of Computing* defines
"command" in an operating system context as "a character string which tells a program to
perform a specific action. Most commands take arguments which either modify the action
performed or supply it with input. Commands may be typed by the user or read from a
file by a command interpreter. It is also common to refer to menu items as commands."
The Free On-line Dictionary of Computing, Denis Howe (1993-2004) (both the *American*

Heritage and *Free On-line Dictionary of Computing* definitions are available at www.dictionary.com). The web site www.webopedia.com defines the term "command" as:

> An instruction to a computer or device to perform a specific task. Commands come in different forms. They can be: special words (keywords) that a program understands; function keys; choices in a menu; [or] buttons or other graphical objects on your screen. Every program that interacts with people responds to a specific set of commands. The set of commands and the syntax for entering them is called the user interface and varies from one program to another.
> www.webopedia.com (February 24, 2003).

Accordingly, the term "command" is understood by those of skill in the art. Further, an applicant may serve as his or her own lexicographer. See MPEP § 2111.02, quoting *In Re Paulsen, 30 F.3d 1475, 1480, 31 USPQ2d 1671, 1674 (Fed. Cir. 1994)*. The term "force feedback command" is described explicitly in eight paragraphs of the specification. Specification, ¶¶ 44, 52, 65, 66, 68, 79, 80, and 140. The term "command" is described in twenty-six paragraphs of the specification, including the eight mentioned above. Specification, ¶¶ 44, 47, 52, 55, 65, 66, 68-70, 73, 74, 79-81, 100, 105, 123, 139-141, 155, 156, 158, 168, 172, and 183.

In many of these latter instances, the description of the command is a description of a force feedback command. For example, in paragraph 81, the specification describes a force feedback button, which when clicked will "cause a 'buzz' command to be sent to the force feedback device." The "buzz" command is a force feedback command. In paragraph 140, the specification describes an ActiveX control that "commands a texture force to be output on the mouse so that the user can feel it." The command output is a force feedback command.

Accordingly, the terms "force feedback command" and "command" are enabled, and Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of all claims.

II.   Claims 79 and 95

The Final Office Action stated that claims 79 and 95 claim "receiving an input signal from a network, the input signal comprising an embedded force feedback command," and that the specification includes no enabling support. Respectfully, "receiving an input signal from a network, the input signal comprising an embedded force feedback command" is enabled in the application.

One of ordinary skill in the networking art understands that computers utilize signals to transfer information. For example, in the *Microsoft Computer Dictionary*, a signal is defined as "any electrical quantity, such as voltage, current, or frequency, that can be used to transmit information." *Microsoft Computer Dictionary – 5th Edition*, Microsoft Press (2002). The specification states, for example, "[i]n one embodiment, instructions are provided in the received web page which define an authored force effect for the plug-in. It essentially embeds function calls which are handled by the web browser." Specification, ¶ 155. Thus, "receiving an input signal from a network, the input signal comprising an embedded force feedback command" is enabled in the application. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 79 and 95.

III.   Claims 91 and 102

The final Office Action stated that the Examiner is unable to find enabling support for a receiving step of claims 91 and 102. Claims 91 and 102 include "receiving a force feedback command." According to the specification, "FIG. 17b illustrates another example of providing options for the user to assign a force effect for a web page object. Assignment window 447 allows the user to assign one or more force effects from a list 448." Specification, ¶ 172. "The force-enabled authoring tool preferably automatically generates this [HTML] code when the user wishes to save the created web page."

4

Specification, ¶ 172. In order to generate the HTML code, the force-enabled authoring tool received the force feedback command. Thus "receiving a force feedback command" is enabled in the application. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 91 and 102.

IV.   Manipulandum in Claims 82, 84, 96

The final Office Action stated that the Examiner is unable to find support in the specification for "manipulandum" as claimed in claims 82, 84, and 96. Manipulandum is defined in paragraph 55 of the specification, which states "User manipulatable object (or "manipulandum") 36, in the described embodiment, is a mouse." Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 82, 84, and 96.

V.   Claims 86 and 97

The final Office Action stated that the Examiner is unable to find support in the specification for "overriding the first force feedback command with a second force feedback command" as claimed in claims 86 and 97.

The specification states "a web page can include force feedback information for authored effects (described below), and generic effects can also be applied to web page objects not having any authored effects associated with them, *or to override particular authored effects* as desired by the user of the client." Specification, ¶ 85 (emphasis added). In the described embodiment, the authored force feedback effect comprises the first force feedback command; the generic effect command comprises the second force feedback command. Thus "overriding the first force feedback command with a second force feedback command" is enabled in the application. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 86 and 97.

VI.   Claims 88 and 99

The final Office Action stated that the Examiner is unable to find support in the specification for "generic force feedback command" as claimed in claims 88 and 99. As shown above in relation to claims 86 and 97, support for "generic force feedback

command" can be found in the specification and claims as originally filed. Thus "generic force feedback command" is enabled in the application and the claims as originally filed. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 88 and 99.

VII.   Claims 89 and 100

The final Office Action stated that the Examiner is unable to find support in the specification for "...generating...associated with the second force feedback command" as claimed in claims 89 and 100.

In claims 89 and 100, Applicant claims, "generating a force feedback effect associated with the second force feedback command." In the specification, Applicant describes generating a force feedback effect on a manipulandum in response to receiving a force feedback command. For example:

> In addition, computer 48 and/or interface 100 provide force
> feedback signals to actuators coupled to interface 100, and
> the actuators generate forces on members of the mechanical
> portion of the interface 100 to provide forces on mouse 36
> in provided or desired degrees of freedom.
> Specification, ¶ 58.

In the embodiment described above in relation to claims 86 and 97, the second force feedback command comprises the generic force feedback command. The generic force feedback command is associated with a particular force feedback effect. An actuator is able to generate an effect in response to receiving a force feedback signal. Thus, "generating a force feedback effect associated with the second force feedback command" is enabled. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 89 and 100.

VIII. Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims 79-105 are allowable. Applicant respectfully solicits the issuance of a Notice of Allowance for all claims.

Should the Examiner have any comments, questions or suggestions of a nature necessary to expedite the prosecution of the application, he is courteously requested to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 9, 2004

John C. Alemanni (Reg. No. 47,384)
Attorney for Applicant

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
1001 West Fourth Street
Winston-Salem, NC 27101-2400
336-607-7311 (telephone)
335-734-2621 (facsimile)

51851-281191
WINLIB01:1087524.1